arXiv:1301.6889v1 [math.AG] 29 Jan 2013

ABUNDANCE THEOREM FOR SEMI LOG CANONICAL SURFACES IN POSITIVE CHARACTERISTIC

HIROMU TANAKA

Abstract. We prove the abundance theorem for semi log canonical surfaces in positive characteristic.

Contents

0.	Introduction	1
1.	Notations	3
2.	Boundaries of dlt surfaces	3
3.	Abundance theorem for slc surfaces	11
4.	Appendix: Fundamental properties of dlt surfaces	19
References		22

0. Introduction

A semi log canonical (for short, slc) n-fold is a generalization of log canonical (for short, lc) n-folds. In this paper, we prove the abundance theorem for slc surfaces in positive characteristic.

Theorem 0.1. *Let* (X, Δ) *be a projective slc surface over an algebraically closed field of positive characteristic. If* $K_X + \Delta$ *is nef, then* $K_X + \Delta$ *is semi-ample.*

Let us briefly review the history of the semi log canonical varieties in characteristic zero. The notion of semi log canonical singularities is introduced in [KSB] for a moduli problem. The abundance theorem for slc surfaces is proved in [AFKM] and [KeKo]. [Fujino1] generalizes this result to dimension three. Moreover, [Fujino1] shows that the abundance theorem for slc n-folds follows from the two parts:

(1) The abundance theorem for lc n-folds.

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 14E30.

Key words and phrases. abundance theorem, semi log canonical, positive characteristic.

(2) The finiteness theorem of the pluri-canonical representation for $(n-1)$-folds.

[FG] shows that (2) holds for each $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{>0}$. If $n = 3$, then (1) follows from [KeMaMc]. If $n \geq 4$, then (1) is an open problem. For a recent development of the theory of slc varieties in characteristic zero, see [Fujino2], [FG], [Gongyo] and [HX]. For related topics, see [Kawamata], [AFM] and [KoMaMc].

In this paper, we use the strategy of [Fujino1]. Hence, we must prove (1) and (2) in the case where $n = 2$ and $\operatorname{char} k > 0$. (1) is a known result by [Fujita]. It is not defficult to prove (2). However, [Fujino1] uses many fundamental results based on the minimal model theory and the Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem. We can freely use the minimal model theory for surfaces in positive characteristic by [T1] (cf. [Fujita], [KoKo]). Although there exist counter-examples to the Kodaira vanishing theorem in positive characteristic ([Raynaud]), we can use some weaker vanishing theorems obtained in [T2] and [Xie] (cf. [KoKo]).

In positive characteristic, some new phenomena happen. For example, in characteristic zero, the Whitney umbrella $\{x^2 = yz^2\} \subset \mathbb{A}^3$ is a typical example of slc surfaces (cf. [AFKM, Definition 12.2.1]). But, in characteristic two, this is not slc. Moreover, [Fujino1] uses the following fact: if a field extension L/K satisfies $[L : K] = 2$ and its characteristic is zero, then L/K is a Galois extension. But, in characteristic two, this field extension L/K may be purely inseparable. Thus, some proofs are more complicated.

0.2 (Overview of contents)**.** In Section 1, we summarize the notations. The normalization of an slc surface is an lc surface. Therefore, we should investigate lc surfaces. Every lc surface is birational to a dlt surface. Thus, in Section 2, we consider a dlt surface (X, Δ). More precisely, we consider $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ because $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ has the patching data of the normalization. In Section 3, we prove the main theorem. In Section 4, we summarize fundamental results on dlt surfaces. These results may be well-known but the author can not find a good reference.

Acknowledgments. The author would like to thank Professor Osamu Fujino for many comments and discussions. In particular, Professor Osamu Fujino teaches him Proposition 2.5 and Theorem 3.9 in this paper. He thanks Professor Atsushi Moriwaki for warm encouragement.

1. Notations

We will not distinguish the notations invertible sheaves and Cartier divisors. For example, we will write $L+M$ for invertible sheaves L and M.

Throughout this paper, we work over an algebraically closed field k of positive characteristic and let $\operatorname{char} k =: p$.

In this paper, a *variety* means a pure dimensional reduced scheme which is separated and of finite type over k. A *curve* or a *surface* means a variety whose dimension is one or two, respectively. Note that varieties, curves and surfaces may be reducible.

Let X be a noetherian reduced scheme and let $X = \bigcup X_i$ be the irreducible decomposition. Let $Y_i \to X_i$ be the normalization of X_i. Then we define the *normalization* of X by $\coprod Y_i \to \coprod X_i \to X$. We say X is *normal* if the normalization morphism is an isomorphism.

Let X be a variety. We say Δ is a $\mathbb{Q}$-*Weil divisor* on X if Δ is a finite sum $\Delta = \sum \delta_i \Delta_i$ where $\delta_i \in \mathbb{Q}$ and Δ_i is an irreducible and reduced closed subscheme which is not contained in the singular locus $\operatorname{Sing}(X)$. Note that, in this case, the local ring $\mathcal{O}_{X,\Delta_i}$ is a discrete valuation ring.

We will freely use the notation and terminology in [Kollár-Mori]. In the definition in [Kollár-Mori, Section 2.3], for a pair (X, Δ), Δ is not necessarily effective. But, in this paper, we assume Δ is an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor. For a reducible normal variety X and an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Weil divisor Δ, we say (X, Δ) is lc (resp. dlt, klt) if each irreducible component is lc (resp. dlt, klt).

Definition 1.1. Let X be a quasi-projective variety which is S_2 and normal crossing in codimension one. Let Δ be an effective $\mathbb{Q}$-Weil divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier. Let $\nu : Y \to X$ be the normalization and we define Δ_Y by $K_Y + \Delta_Y = \nu^*(K_X + \Delta)$. We say (X, Δ) is *slc* if (Y, Δ_Y) is lc. We say (X, Δ) is *sdlt* if (Y, Δ_Y) is dlt and every irreducible component of X is normal.

The above definition of slc varieties is a naive analogue of that in characteristic zero. This may not be a correct definition of slc varieties in positive characteristic. But, in this paper, we adopt this definition and prove the abundance theorem for slc surfaces in positive characteristic.

2. Boundaries of dlt surfaces

In this section, we investigate dlt surfaces. First, we consider the case of curves. The main result of this section is Proposition 2.8. Proposition 2.8 is the surface version of Proposition 2.1.

Proposition 2.1. *Let* (X, Δ) *be an irreducible lc curve. Let* $f : X \to R$ *be a projective surjective morphism such that* $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_R$. *Assume that* $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$ *and let* $T := f(S)$. *If* $K_X + \Delta \equiv_f 0$, *then one of the following assertions holds.*

1. $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$.
2. $f_*\mathcal{O}_S \neq \mathcal{O}_T$. $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ *and* $\dim R = 0$. *Moreover,* $\Delta = S$ *and* S *is two distinct points.*

Proof. If $\dim R = 1$, then we see $X \simeq R$ and we obtain (1). We may assume $\dim R = 0$. Since $\deg(K_X + \Delta) = 0$ and $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$, we see $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ and S has at most two points. If S is one point, then we obtain (1). $\square$

In the above proposition, (1) is a good case. Hence, we classify the other case (2) as above. For this, we want sufficient conditions for $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$.

We use the following vanishing theorem for rational surfaces essentially established in [Xie].

Proposition 2.2. *Let* (X, B) *be a projective klt surface such that* X *is a rational surface. Let* D *be a* $\mathbb{Q}$*-Cartier* $\mathbb{Z}$*-divisor such that* $D-(K_X+B)$ *is nef and big. Then,* $H^1(X, D) = 0$.

Proof. Let $f : Y \to X$ be a birational morphism from a smooth projective surface Y such that

1. $f^{-1}(B) \cup \mathrm{Ex}(f) \cup \sum F_j$ is a simple normal crossing divisor.
2. $f^*(D - (K_X + B)) - \sum \delta_j F_j$ is ample for some $0 < \delta_j \ll 1$.
3. $\ulcorner f^*(D - (K_X + B)) - \sum \delta_j F_j \urcorner = \ulcorner f^*(D - (K_X + B))\urcorner$.

We define E by $K_Y = f^*(K_X + B) + E$. Since (X, B) is klt, $\ulcorner E \urcorner$ is effective and f-exceptional. Thus, we obtain $\mathcal{O}_X(D) = f_*\mathcal{O}_Y(\ulcorner f^*D + E\urcorner)$. Therefore, by the Leray spectral sequence, we obtain

$$0 \to H^1(X, \mathcal{O}_X(D)) \to H^1(Y, \mathcal{O}_Y(\ulcorner f^*D + E\urcorner)).$$

Then, the assertion holds by

$$H^1(Y, \ulcorner f^*D + E\urcorner) = H^1(Y, K_Y + \ulcorner f^*(D - (K_X + B)) - \sum \delta_j F_j \urcorner) = 0.$$

where the last equation follows from [Xie, Theorem 1.4]. $\square$

Proposition 2.3. *Let* $f : X \to Y$ *be a projective surjective morphism between irreducible normal varieties such that* $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y$. *Assume the following conditions.*

1. (X, Δ) *is a* $\mathbb{Q}$*-factorial lc surface such that* $(X, \{\Delta\})$ *is klt.*
2. $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$ *and let* $T := f(S)$.
3. $-(K_X + \Delta)$ *is* f*-nef and* f*-big.*

Then, $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$. *In particular, for every* $y \in Y$, $S \cap f^{-1}(y)$ *is connected or an empty set.*

Proof.

Step 1. In this step, we assume $\dim Y \geq 1$ and we prove the assertion. Consider the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_X(-\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner) \to \mathcal{O}_X \to \mathcal{O}_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} \to 0.$$

Take the push-forward by f:

$$0 \to f_*\mathcal{O}_X(-\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner) \to \mathcal{O}_Y \to f_*\mathcal{O}_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} \to R^1 f_*\mathcal{O}_X(-\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner).$$

It is sufficient to prove that the last term $R^1 f_*\mathcal{O}_X(-\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner)$ vanishes. Since

$$-\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner = K_X + \{\Delta\} - (K_X + \Delta),$$

we have $R^1 f_*\mathcal{O}_X(-\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner) = 0$ by [T2, Theorem 2.12].

Step 2. In this step, we assume $\dim Y = 0$ and we prove the assertion. It is sufficient to prove that S is connected. Since rational surfaces satisfy the Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem by Proposition 2.2, we can apply the same argument as Step 1. Thus we may assume that X is not rational. We can run a $(K_X + \Delta)$-MMP by [T1, Theorem 6.8]. Then we have

$$h : X \overset{q}{\to} X' \overset{h'}{\to} R$$

where $q : X \to X'$ is a composition of extremal birational contractions and $h' : X' \to R$ is a Mori fiber space.

We prove $\dim R = 1$. Let $\mu : X'' \to X'$ be a resolution and $X'' \to Q$ be the ruled surface structure. We may assume that Q is not rational. Note that X' has at worst rational singularities, because $(X, \{\Delta\})$ is klt and $R^1 q_*\mathcal{O}_X = 0$. (cf. [T2, Theorem 2.12]) Therefore each μ-exceptional curves goes to one point by $X'' \to Q$. Thus $X'' \to Q$ factors through X'. In particular, there exists a surjection $X' \to Q$ to a smooth projective curve. This means $\rho(X') \geq 2$. Therefore we see $\dim R \neq 0$.

Hence we may assume $\dim R = 1$. Note that $-(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ is nef and big. Assume that $-(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ is ample. Since $\rho(X') = 2$, X' has the two $(K_{X'} + \Delta')$-negative extremal rays. Since these extremal rays are spanned by rational curves (cf. [T1, Proposition 4.6]), R is a rational curve. If $X'' \to X'$ is a resolution, then $X'' \to R$ is a ruled surface structure. This means that X'' is rational. This case is excluded. Therefore we may assume that $-(K_{X'} + \Delta')$ is not ample. Then, by the Nakai–Moishezon criterion, there exists a curve C' on X' such that

$(K_{X'}+\Delta')\cdot C'=0$. This implies $C'^2<0$ and $h'(C')=R$. Moreover we see

$$0=(K_{X'}+\Delta')\cdot C'\geq (K_{X'}+C')\cdot C'.$$

If $0>(K_{X'}+C')\cdot C'$, then $C'\simeq \mathbb{P}^1$ by [T1, Theorem 5.3]. This case is excluded. Thus the above inequality is an equality. In particular, we have $C'\subset \llcorner \Delta' \lrcorner$. Let $C\subset X$ be the proper transform of C'. Then C satisfies $h(C)=R$ and $C\subset \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$. We can apply Step 1 of this proof to $h:X\to R$ because $-(K_X+\Delta)$ is h-nef and h-big. Then, $S\cap h^{-1}(r)$ is connected for every $r\in R$. This and $h(C)=R$ imply that S is connected.

□

Lemma 2.4. *Let*

$$f:X\overset{q}{\to} X'\overset{f'}{\to} R$$

be projective morphisms between normal varieties such that q is birational and $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{X'}=\mathcal{O}_R$. Assume the following conditions.

1. *(X,Δ) is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial lc surface such that $(X,\{\Delta\})$ is klt.*
2. *$\mathrm{Ex}(q)=:E$ is an irreducible curve.*
3. *$-(K_X+\Delta)$ is q-nef.*
4. *$\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ is q-nef.*

Then, for every $r\in R$, the number of connected components of $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\cap f^{-1}(r)$ is equal to the number of connected components of $\llcorner q_*\Delta \lrcorner \cap f'^{-1}(r)$.

Proof. Let $q(E)=:x'_0$ and $f'(x'_0)=:r_0$. If $E\cap \mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner=\emptyset$, then the assertion is clear. Thus, we may assume $E\cap \mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\neq\emptyset$. Since $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ is q-nef, we see $q(\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner)=\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner q_*\Delta \lrcorner$. Then, for every $r\in R$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} q(\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\cap f^{-1}(r)) &= q(\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\cap q^{-1}(f'^{-1}(r)))\\ &= q(\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner)\cap f'^{-1}(r)\\ &= \mathrm{Supp}\llcorner q_*\Delta \lrcorner\cap f'^{-1}(r).\end{aligned}$$

Assume that the numbers of connected components are different. Then there exist at least two connected components X_1 and X_2 of $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\cap f^{-1}(r_0)$ such that $x'_0\in q(X_1)$ and $x'_0\in q(X_2)$. We take the intersection

$$\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\cap f^{-1}(r_0)=X_1\amalg X_2\amalg\cdots$$

with $q^{-1}(x'_0)$ and we obtain the following equation

$$\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner\cap q^{-1}(x'_0)=(X_1\cap q^{-1}(x'_0))\amalg (X_2\cap q^{-1}(x'_0))\amalg\cdots.$$

Thus, in order to derive a contradiction, it is sufficient to prove that $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner\cap q^{-1}(x'_0)$ is connected. Since $-(K_X+\Delta)$ is q-nef and q-big, we can apply Proposition 2.3. Thus $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner \cap q^{-1}(x'_0)$ is connected. □

Proposition 2.5. *Let $f : X \to Y$ be a projective surjective morphism between irreducible normal varieties such that $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_Y$. Assume the following conditions.*

1. *(X, Δ) is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial lc surface such that $(X, \{\Delta\})$ is klt.*
2. *$S := \llcorner\Delta\lrcorner \neq 0$ and let $T := f(S)$.*
3. *$K_X + \Delta \equiv_f 0$.*
4. *$T = f(S) \subsetneq Y$.*

Then, $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$. In particular, for every $y \in Y$, $S \cap f^{-1}(y)$ is connected or an empty set.

Proof. By (4), we have $\dim Y \neq 0$. If $\dim Y = 2$, then the assertion follows from Proposition 2.3. Thus we may assume that $\dim Y = 1$. It is sufficient to prove that $\mathcal{O}_Y = f_*\mathcal{O}_X \to f_*\mathcal{O}_S$ is surjective. Since the problem is local, by shrinking Y, we may assume that $f(S) = P \in Y$. If S is connected, then $f_*\mathcal{O}_S \simeq \mathcal{O}_P$ and $\mathcal{O}_Y \to f_*\mathcal{O}_S$ is surjective. Therefore, it is sufficient to prove that S is connected. We define a reduced divisor D by

$$S + D = \mathrm{Supp}(f^*P).$$

If $D = 0$, then S is connected since $S = \mathrm{Supp}(f^*P)$. Therefore, we assume that $D \neq 0$. Then, there exists an irreducible curve $E \subset \mathrm{Supp}D$ such that $E \cap S \neq 0$. We see $(K_X + \{\Delta\}) \cdot E < 0$. Thus, we obtain a birational morphism $q : X \to X'$ such that $\mathrm{Ex}(q) = E$. Let $\Delta' := q_*\Delta$. By Lemma 2.4, if $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner$ is connected, then so is $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner$. We can repeat this argument and we obtain a projective morphisms

$$f : X \overset{\tilde{q}}{\to} X'' \overset{f''}{\to} Y$$

where $\tilde{q}$ is a birational morphism such that $\mathrm{Ex}(\tilde{q}) = \mathrm{Supp}D$. Let $\Delta'' := \tilde{q}_*\Delta$. It is sufficient to show that $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner\Delta''\lrcorner$ is connected. This follows from $\mathrm{Supp}\llcorner\Delta''\lrcorner = \mathrm{Supp}(f''^*P)$. □

In Proposition 2.8, the most complicated case is the Mori fiber space to a curve. Thus we investigate this case in the following lemma.

Lemma 2.6. *Let $f' : X' \to R$ be a projective surjective morphism between normal varieties such that $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{X'} = \mathcal{O}_R$. Assume the following conditions.*

1. *(X', Δ') is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial lc surface such that $(X', \{\Delta'\})$ is klt.*
2. *$S' := \llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner \neq 0$.*
3. *$K_{X'} + \Delta' \equiv_{f'} 0$.*

(4) *There is a* $(K_{X'}+\{\Delta'\})$*-negative extremal contraction* $g' : X' \to V$ *over* R *such that* $\dim V = 1$.

Then the g'*-horizontal part* $(S')^h$ *of* S' *satisfies one of the following assertions.*

(a) $(S')^h = S'_1$*, which is a prime divisor, and* $[K(S'_1) : K(V)] = 2$.
(b) $(S')^h = S'_1$*, which is a prime divisor, and* $[K(S'_1) : K(V)] = 1$.
(c) $(S')^h = S'_1 + S'_2$*, where each* S'_i *is a prime divisor, and* $[K(S'_i) : K(V)] = 1$.

Furthermore, there is a $\mathbb{Q}$*-Cartier* $\mathbb{Q}$*-divisor* D_V *on* V *such that* $K_X + \Delta = g'^*(D_V)$.
In the case (b), $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'} = \mathcal{O}_{f'(S')}$.

Proof. The assumption (3) means $K_{X'} + \Delta' \equiv_{g'} 0$. Thus, by (4), $\llcorner \Delta' \lrcorner$ is g'-ample. We see $(S')^h \neq 0$.

We prove that general fibers of $g' : X' \to V$ are $\mathbb{P}^1$. The dimension of every fiber is one. Since $\dim V = 1$ and $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{X'} = \mathcal{O}_V$, the field extension $K(X')/K(V)$ is algebraically closed and separable (cf. [Bădescu, Lemma 7.2]). Therefore general fibers are geometrically integral. Let F be a general fiber of g', that is, F is a fiber which is an proper integral curve such that $F \cap \mathrm{Sing}(X) = \emptyset$. The adjunction formula implies

$$(K_{X'} + F) \cdot F = K_{X'} \cdot F = -\Delta' \cdot F \leq -(S')^h \cdot F < 0.$$

This means $F \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$.

By $(K_{X'} + F) \cdot F = -2$, we have $(S')^h \cdot F \leq 2$ for a general fiber F. Therefore one of (a), (b) and (c) holds. By the abundance theorem ([T1, Theorem 18.4]), we see $K_{X'} + \Delta' \sim_{\mathbb{Q},g'} 0$. This means $m(K_{X'} + \Delta') = g'^*(D)$ for some integer m and some $\mathbb{Z}$-divisor D on V. We define a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D_V by $D = mD_V$.

Assume (b) and let us prove $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'} = \mathcal{O}_{f'(S')}$. Since $\dim V = 1$, we have $\dim R = 0$ or $\dim R = 1$. Assume $\dim R = 0$. It is sufficient to prove that S' is connected. This holds because all of the fibers of g' are irreducible and $(S')^h \neq 0$. Assume $\dim R = 1$. Then, we see $f'(S') = V \simeq R$. Since S'_1 and R are birational, the morphism $f|_{S'_1} : S'_1 \to R$ is an isomorphism. We can write

$$S' = S'_1 + F_1 + \cdots + F_r$$

where each F_i is the reduced subscheme whose support is a fiber of g'.

We prove $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'} = \mathcal{O}_R$ by the induction on r. If $r = 0$, then the assertion follows from $S'_1 \simeq R$. Assume $r > 0$. Consider the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_{S'} \to \mathcal{O}_{S'-F_r} \oplus \mathcal{O}_{F_r} \to \mathcal{O}_{(S'-F_r)\cap F_r} \to 0.$$

The last map defined by the difference. Note that the last term is the scheme-theoretic intersection. It is easy to see that $(S'-F_r)\cap F_r \simeq S'_1\cap F_r$. Then $(S'-F_r)\cap F_r$ is reduced because $S'_1\simeq R$. Consider the push-forward of the above exact sequence:

$$0\to f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}\to f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'-F_r}\oplus f'_*\mathcal{O}_{F_r}\to f'_*\mathcal{O}_{(S'-F_r)\cap F_r}\to R^1f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}.$$

We see $R^1f'_*\mathcal{O}_{X'}=0$ by [T2, Theorem 2.12]. This implies $R^1f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}=0$. Since F_r and $(S'-F_r)\cap F_r$ are reduced, we have $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{F_r}\simeq f'_*\mathcal{O}_{(S'-F_r)\cap F_r}\simeq \mathcal{O}_{f'(F_r)}$. This means $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}\to f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'-F_r}$ is an isomorphism. By the induction hypothesis, we obtain $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}\simeq f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'-F_r}\simeq\mathcal{O}_R$. □

Remark 2.7. In the last argument in the above proof, we use the following fact. Let A be a ring and let M, N, L and P are A-modules. Assume the exact sequence

$$0\to M\overset{(\varphi_1,\varphi_2)}{\to} N\oplus L\overset{\psi-\theta}{\to} P\to 0.$$

If $\theta: L\to P$ is an isomorphism, then $\varphi_1: M\to N$ is also an isomorphism.

We can prove the following main result in this section.

Proposition 2.8. *Let (X,Δ) be an irreducible dlt surface. Let $f: X\to R$ be a projective surjective morphism such that $f_*\mathcal{O}_X=\mathcal{O}_R$. Assume that $S:=\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner\neq 0$ and let $T:=f(S)$. If $K_X+\Delta\equiv_f 0$, then one of the following assertions holds.*

(1) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S=\mathcal{O}_T$.

(2) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S\neq\mathcal{O}_T$. *There exist a projective surjective R-morphism $g: X\to V$ to a smooth curve V and a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor D_V on V such that $g_*\mathcal{O}_X=\mathcal{O}_V$ and that $K_X+\Delta=g^*(D_V)$ as $\mathbb{Q}$-divisors. Every connected component of S intersects the g-horizontal part S^h of S. Moreover, the g-horizontal part S^h satisfies one of the following assertions.*

  (2.1s) $S^h=S_1$, *which is a prime divisor, and* $[K(S_1):K(V)]=2$. *This field extension is separable.*

  (2.1i) $S^h=S_1$, *which is a prime divisor, and* $[K(S_1):K(V)]=2$. *This field extension is purely inseparable.*

  (2.2) $S^h=S_1+S_2$, *where S_i is a prime divisor, and $g|_{S_i}: S_i\to V$ is an isomorphism for $i=1,2$.*

Proof. If f is birational, then Proposition 2.5 implies (1). Thus we may assume that $\dim R<\dim X$. We run a $(K_X+\{\Delta\})$-MMP on X over R. The end result is a proper birational morphism $q: X\to X'$ over R. Let $f': X'\to R$ be the induced morphism. Since $K_X+\Delta\equiv_f 0$, we obtain that $K_{X'}+\Delta'\equiv_{f'}0$ where $\Delta':=q_*\Delta$. Let $S':=\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner$. Then it is easy to see that (X',Δ') is a $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial lc pair and $(X,\{\Delta'\})$ is klt.

Step 1. Assume that $(X',\{\Delta'\})$ is a minimal model over R. Then $K_{X'}+\{\Delta'\}$ is f'-nef and $K_{X'}+\Delta'\equiv_{f'}0$. So $-\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner$ is f'-nef. If $\dim R=0$, then $\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner=0$ because X' is projective. Lemma 2.4 implies $\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner=0$. This case is excluded. Assume $\dim R=1$. Since $-\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner$ is f'-nef, we see $f'(\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner)\subsetneq R$. Therefore, by Proposition 2.5, we obtain (1).

Step 2. Assume that there exists a Mori fiber space structure $g':X'\to V$ over R. Let

$$g:X\xrightarrow{q}X'\xrightarrow{g'}V.$$

Then $-(K_{X'}+\{\Delta'\})$ is g'-ample. Note that, if $\dim V=1$, then we can apply Lemma 2.6 and every connected component of S intersects S^h by Lemma 2.4.

First, assume that $\dim R=0$. If $\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner$ is connected, then we have (1) by Lemma 2.4. Thus we may assume that $\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner$ is not connected.

We show $\dim V=1$. Assume $\dim V=0$. Then $\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner$ is ample. Thus its suitable multiple is an effective ample Cartier divisor. This must be connected by the Serre vanishing theorem. This case is excluded.

Thus we can apply Lemma 2.6. Since all of the fibers of the Mori fiber space $g':X'\to V$ are irreducible, we see $\llcorner\Delta'\lrcorner=S'_1+S'_2$. This implies (2.2).

Second, assume that $\dim R=1$. Then we have $\dim V=1$. Note that $T=R\simeq V$. We can apply Lemma 2.6. Thus we obtain $(a),(b)$ or (c) of Lemma 2.6. If (a) or (c) holds, then (2) holds. Thus we may assume that (b) of Lemma 2.6 holds. We have $f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}=\mathcal{O}_T$. Lemma 2.4 implies $q(S)=S'$. By Proposition 2.3, we have $f_*\mathcal{O}_S=f'_*\mathcal{O}_{S'}=\mathcal{O}_T$.

□

Example 2.9. *Let* $\operatorname{char}k=2$. *Then, there exists a projective dlt surface* (X,Δ) *and smooth projective curve* R *which satisfy* Proposition 2.8(2.1i).

Construction. Let $X_0:=\mathbb{A}^2$ and let $C_0:=\{(x,y)\in\mathbb{A}^2\,|\,x=y^2\}$. Note that the restriction of the first projection to C_0 is purely inseparable of degree two. Let $X_0\subset X:=\mathbb{P}^1\times\mathbb{P}^1$ be the natural open immersion and let C be the closure of C_0 in X. Let $g:X\to\mathbb{P}^1=:V=:R$ be the first projection. It is easy to see that C is smooth and $K_X+C\sim g^*\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}^1}(-1)$. Thus, we see that $(X,\Delta:=C)$ is dlt and that (X,Δ) satisfies Proposition 2.8(2.1i). □

3. Abundance theorem for slc surfaces

We recall the B-birational maps introduced in [Fujino1].

Definition 3.1. Let (X, Δ_X) and (Y, Δ_Y) be lc varieties (may be reducible). We say $\sigma : (X, \Delta_X) \dashrightarrow (Y, \Delta_Y)$ is a B-birational map if $\sigma : X \dashrightarrow Y$ is a birational map and there exist birational morphisms $\alpha : W \to X$ and $\beta : W \to Y$ from a normal variety W such that $\beta = \sigma \circ \alpha$ and $\alpha^*(K_X + \Delta_X) = \beta^*(K_Y + \Delta_Y)$. We define

$$\mathrm{Aut}(X, \Delta_X) := \{\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(X) \mid K_X + \Delta_X = \sigma^*(K_X + \Delta_X)\}.$$

Let us recall the admissible sections introduced in [Fujino1]. Note that we also consider the p-power of admissible sections as follows.

Definition 3.2. Let (X, Δ) be an n-dimensional projective sdlt variety with $n \leq 2$. Let $X = \bigcup X_i$ be the irreducible decomposition and let $\nu : \coprod X_i \to X$ be the normalization. We define Δ_i by $K_{X_i} + \Delta_i = (\nu^*(K_X + \Delta))|_{X_i}$. Note that (X_i, Δ_i) is dlt. Let m be a positive integer such that $m(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier. We define *admissible sections* and *preadmissible sections* inductively on dimension as follows.

(1) If $n = \dim X = 0$, then every element of $H^0(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ is a preadmissible section.
(2) Let $n = \dim X \geq 1$. We say $s \in H^0(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ is preadmissible if $(\nu^* s)|_{\coprod \llcorner \Delta_i \lrcorner}$ is admissible.
(3) Let $n = \dim X \geq 0$. We say $s \in H^0(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ is admissible if s is preadmissible and $g^*(\nu^* s|_{X_j}) = \nu^* s|_{X_i}$ for every B-birational map $g : (X_i, \Delta_i) \dashrightarrow (X_j, \Delta_j)$.

We define

$$\begin{aligned} PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta)) &:= \{s \text{ is preadmissible}\} \\ A(X, m(K_X + \Delta)) &:= \{s \text{ is admissible}\}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, we define

$$A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta)) := \{t^p \mid t \in A(X, m(K_X + \Delta))\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta)) := \\ &\{s \mid (\nu^* s)|_{\coprod \llcorner \Delta_i \lrcorner} \in A^{(p)}(\coprod \llcorner \Delta_i \lrcorner, pm(K_X + \Delta)|_{\coprod \llcorner \Delta_i \lrcorner})\}. \end{aligned}$$

Remark 3.3. We need $A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$ and $PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$ only for the case where $\mathrm{char}\, k = p = 2$. For more details, see the proof of Proposition 3.7.

The following lemma teaches us that, in order to obtain sections on an slc surface, we should consider preadmissible sections on a dlt surface.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* (X, Δ) *be a projective slc surface. Let* $\nu : Y \to X$ *be the normalization and let* $K_Y + \Delta_Y := \nu^*(K_X + \Delta)$*. Let* $\mu : (Z, \Delta_Z) \to (Y, \Delta_Y)$ *be a birational morphism from a projective dlt surface* (Z, Δ_Z) *such that* $K_Z + \Delta_Z = \mu^*(K_Y + \Delta_Y)$*. If* $s \in PA(Z, m(K_Z + \Delta_Z))$*, then* $s = \mu^*\nu^*t$ *for some* $t \in H^0(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$*.*

Proof. The assertion holds because X is S_2 and normal crossing in codimension one. $\square$

We summarize the basic properties of p-power of admissible sections.

Lemma 3.5. *Let* (X, Δ) *be a projective sdlt variety with* $n \leq 2$*. Let* m *be a positive integer such that* $m(K_X + \Delta)$ *is Cartier.*

(1) *If* $s \in PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$*, then* $s^p \in PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$*.*
(2) *If* $s \in A(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$*, then* $s^p \in A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$*.*
(3) *If* $t \in PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$*, then* $t \in PA(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$*.*
(4) *If* $t \in A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$*, then* $t \in A(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$*.*
(5) *Assume that* X *is normal and let* $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$*. If the map*
$$PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta)) \to A(S, m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$$
is surjective, then so is the map
$$PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta)) \to A^{(p)}(S, pm(K_X + \Delta)|_S).$$
(6) *If the vector space* $PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ *generates* $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta))$*, then* $PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$ *generates* $\mathcal{O}_X(pm(K_X + \Delta))$*.*
(7) *If the vector space* $A(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ *generates* $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta))$*, then* $A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$ *generates* $\mathcal{O}_X(pm(K_X + \Delta))$*. Moreover, the inverse assertion holds.*

Proof. (2) This follows from the definition.
(1) This follows from $(\nu^* s^p)|_{\coprod \llcorner \Delta_i \lrcorner} = ((\nu^* s)|_{\coprod \llcorner \Delta_i \lrcorner})^p$.
(3)(4) By the induction on $\dim X$, we see that, if s is preadmissible (resp. admissible), then so is s^p. This means the assertion.
(5)(6) These assertions follow from (1).
(7) The first assertion follows from (2). Therefore let us only prove the inverse assertion. Assume that $A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(pm(K_X + \Delta))$. Let $s_1, \cdots, s_r$ be a basis of $A^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X + \Delta))$. We can write, for every i, $s_i = \tilde{s_i}^p$ where $\tilde{s_i} \in A(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$. Since $\tilde{s_1}^p, \cdots, \tilde{s_r}^p$ have no common zeros, $\tilde{s_1}, \cdots, \tilde{s_r}$ have no common zeros. $\square$

Lemma 3.6. *Let* (X, Δ) *be a proper lc curve or a proper lc surface such that* $K_X + \Delta$ *is semi-ample and* $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$*. Let* $f := \varphi_{|k(K_X + \Delta)|} : X \to R$ *be a surjective morphism to a projective variety* R *such that* $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_R$*. Let* $T := f(S)$*. Assume the following conditions.*

(a) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$.
(b) *There exist sections* $\{s_i\}_{i=1}^q \subset H^0(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ *without common zeros for some* m.

Then, for some $r > 0$, *there exist sections* $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^l \subset H^0(X, rm(K_X+\Delta))$ *which satisfies the following conditions.*

(1) $u_i|_S = s_i^r$ *for* $1 \le i \le q$ *and* $u_i|_S = 0$ *for* $q+1 \le i \le l$.
(2) $\{u_i\}_{i=1}^l$ *have no common zeros.*

Proof. There is an ample $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor H on R such that $K_X + \Delta \sim_{\mathbb{Q}} f^*H$. For $r \gg 0$, we have the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
H^0(X, rm(K_X+\Delta)) \arrow[r] & H^0(S, rm(K_X+\Delta)|_S) \\
H^0(R, rmH) \arrow[u, "\simeq"'] \arrow[r, "\text{surjection}"] & H^0(T, rmH|_T) \arrow[u, "\simeq"']
\end{tikzcd}$$

Let $u_1, \cdots, u_q \in H^0(X, rm(K_X+\Delta))$ be lifts of $s_1^r, \cdots, s_q^r$ and let us consider the following corresponding sections.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
u_i \arrow[r] & s_i^r \\
u_i' \arrow[u] \arrow[r] & s_i' \arrow[u]
\end{tikzcd}$$

We may assume that r is so large that $I_T \otimes \mathcal{O}_R(rmH)$ is generated by global sections where I_T is the corresponding ideal to the closed subscheme T. Let $t'_{q+1}, \cdots, t'_l$ be the basis of $H^0(R, I_T \otimes \mathcal{O}_R(rmH))$ and let $u'_{q+1}, \cdots, u'_l$ be its image to $H^0(R, rmH)$. Then $u'_1, \cdots, u'_l$ have no common zeros. Thus the corresponding sections $u_1, \cdots, u_l$ satisfy the desired properties. ☐

The following proposition is the key to prove the abundance theorem for slc surfaces.

Proposition 3.7. *Let* (X, Δ) *be a projective dlt surface such that* $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$. *Let* m *be a sufficiently large and divisible integer such that* $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}$. *If* $K_X + \Delta$ *is nef, then the following assertions hold.*

(a) *The following map is surjective:*

$$PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X+\Delta)) \to A^{(p)}(S, pm(K_X+\Delta)|_S).$$

(b) *Assume that* $A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ *generates* $\mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$. *Then* $PA^{(p)}(X, pm(K_X+\Delta))$ *generates* $\mathcal{O}_X(pm(K_X+\Delta))$.

Proof. We may assume that X is irreducible. By the abundance theorem (cf. [Fujita]), we obtain $f := \varphi_{|k(K_X+\Delta)|} : X \to R$ such that $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_R$. Let $f(S) =: T$. Then (1) or (2) holds.

(1) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$.
(2) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S \neq \mathcal{O}_T$.

(1)Assume $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$. By the diagram of the proof of Lemma 3.6, the map

$$H^0(X, m(K_X + \Delta)) \to H^0(S, m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$$

is surjective. Thus the map

$$PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta)) \to A(S, m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$$

is also surjective. Thus assertion (a) follows from Lemma 3.5. We prove (b). Since $A(S, m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$ generates $\mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$, $PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ also generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta))$ by Lemma 3.6. The assertion follows from Lemma 3.5.

(2)Assume $f_*\mathcal{O}_S \neq \mathcal{O}_T$. We can apply Proposition 2.8 and we obtain Proposition 2.8(2). Then, we have projective morphisms

$$f : X \xrightarrow{g} V \to R$$

where V is a smooth projective curve.

Case (2.1s). Assume Proposition 2.8(2.1s) holds. By Lemma 3.5, it is sufficient to prove (a)′ and (b)′.

(a)′ The following map is surjective:

$$PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta)) \to A(S, m(K_X + \Delta)|_S).$$

(b)′ Assume that $A(S, m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$ generates $\mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X + \Delta)|_S)$. Then $PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X + \Delta))$.

First we prove (a)′. Note that there is a Galois involution $\iota : S_1 \to S_1$ and ι is B-birational. Let $s \in A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$. Since s is admissible, this section s is invariant for ι. Thus $s|_{S_1}$ is the pull-back of a section $t \in H^0(V, m(D_V))$. Let $u := g^*t \in H^0(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$. We prove that $u|_S = s$. Let $S = \bigcup S_i$ be the irreducible decomposition. Since S is reduced, we obtain the exact sequence:

$$0 \to \mathcal{O}_S \to \bigoplus_i \mathcal{O}_{S_i}.$$

Therefore it is sufficient to prove that $u|_{S_i} = s|_{S_i}$ for every i. For $i = 1$, this is clear by the construction. Thus we may assume that S_i is g-vertical. We take a proper birational morphism $\lambda : X'' \to X$ in Lemma 4.10. Let $g'' : X'' \xrightarrow{\lambda} X \xrightarrow{g} V$. Note that $\lambda_*\mathcal{O}_{S''} = \mathcal{O}_S$ by Lemma 4.10 where $S'' := \llcorner \Delta'' \lrcorner$. Thus it is sufficient to prove that $u''|_{S''_i} = s''|_{S''_i}$ where $u'' := \lambda^*u$, $s'' := \lambda^*s$ and S''_i is an irreducible component of S'' such that g''-vertical. Let S''_1 be the proper transform of S_1. Assume $S''_1 \cap S''_i \neq \emptyset$. Note that, since (X'', Δ'') is dlt, the scheme-theoretic intersection $S''_1 \cap S''_i$ is reduced. Hence, Lemma 4.10 implies $g''_*\mathcal{O}_{S''_i} \simeq g''_*\mathcal{O}_{S''_1 \cap S''_i}$. Since $m(K_{X''}+\Delta'')$ is the pull-back of mD_V, this means

$$H^0(S''_i, m(K_{X''}+\Delta'')|_{S''_i}) \simeq H^0(S''_1 \cap S''_i, m(K_{X''}+\Delta'')|_{S''_1 \cap S''_i}).$$

By $u''|_{S''_1} = s''|_{S''_1}$, we have $u''|_{S''_1 \cap S''_i} = s''|_{S''_1 \cap S''_i}$. Therefore, by the above isomorphism, we see $u''|_{S''_i} = s''|_{S''_i}$. If S''_j satisfies $S''_j \cap S''_i \neq \emptyset$ for $S''_1 \cap S''_i \neq \emptyset$, then $u''|_{S''_j} = s''|_{S''_j}$ by the same argument as above. By the inductive argument, if a vertical irreducible component S''_j is contained in a connected component of S'' which intersects S''_1, then $u''|_{S''_j} = s''|_{S''_j}$. By Lemma 2.4 and Proposition 2.8, every vertical irreducible component S''_i satisfies this property. Therefore, we see $u \in PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$ such that $u|_S = s$.

Second, we prove (b)$'$. We prove that $PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X+\Delta))$. Let $s_1, \cdots, s_r \in A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ be a basis and let $u_1, \cdots, u_r \in PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$ be their lifts. Let $t_1, \cdots, t_r \in H^0(V, mD_V)$ be the corresponding sections. Since $A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ generates $\mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ and $S \to V$ is surjective, $t_1, \cdots, t_r$ have no common zeros. Thus the corresponding sections $u_1, \cdots, u_r$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X+\Delta))$.

Case (2.2). Assume Proposition 2.8(2.2) holds. It is sufficient to prove the above assertions (a)$'$ and (b)$'$.

We prove (a)$'$. Note that there is a B-birational morphism $\iota : S_2 \to S_1$ obtained by $S_2 \simeq V \simeq S_1$. Let $s \in A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$. Since s is admissible, we see $\iota^*(s|_{S_1}) = s|_{S_2}$. Since $S_1 \simeq V$, $s|_{S_1}$ is the pull-back of a section $t \in H^0(V, mD_V)$. Let $u := g^*t \in H^0(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$. We would like to prove that $u|_S = s$. It is sufficient to prove that $u|_{S_i} = s|_{S_i}$ for every irreducible component S_i of S. By the same argument as (2.1s), it is sufficient to prove this equality only for $i = 1, 2$. It is clear in the case where $i = 1$. Since $\iota^*(u|_{S_1}) = u|_{S_2}$, it is also clear in the case where $i = 2$. The assertion (b) holds by the same argument as (2.1s).

Case (2.1i). Assume Proposition 2.8(2.1i) holds. We see $p = \mathrm{char}\, k = 2$.

We prove (a). Let $s \in A^{(2)}(S, 2m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$. Then we have $s = \tilde{s}^2$ where $\tilde{s} \in A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$. Note that $g|_{S_1} : S_1 \to V$ is the geometric Frobenius morphism. Thus the absolute Frobenius morphism $F : S_1 \to S_1$ factors through V:

$$F : S_1 \overset{g|_{S_1}}{\to} V \overset{G}{\to} S_1.$$

Note that G is a non-k-linear isomorphism as schemes and that

$$V \overset{G}{\to} S_1 \overset{g|_{S_1}}{\to} V$$

is the absolute Frobenius morphism of V.

We show $\mathcal{O}_V(2mD_V) \simeq G^*\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(m(K_X+\Delta)|_{S_1})$. Since $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}$, we can write $m = 2m'$ where $m' \in \mathbb{Z}$. First, we see

$$(g|_{S_1})^*\mathcal{O}_V(2m'D_V) \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S_1}(2m'(K_X+\Delta)|_{S_1}) \simeq (g|_{S_1})^*G^*\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(m'(K_X+\Delta)|_{S_1}).$$

Then, for an invertible sheaf

$$M := (G^{-1})^*\mathcal{O}_V(2m'D_V) \otimes \mathcal{O}_{S_1}(-m'(K_X+\Delta)|_{S_1}),$$

we obtain $M^{\otimes 2} = F^*M \simeq \mathcal{O}_{S_1}$. This implies

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{O}_V(2mD_V) &\simeq G^*(g|_{S_1})^*\mathcal{O}_V(2m'D_V) \\ &\simeq G^*F^*(G^{-1})^*\mathcal{O}_V(2m'D_V) \\ &\simeq G^*F^*\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(m'(K_X+\Delta)|_{S_1}) \\ &\simeq G^*\mathcal{O}_{S_1}(m(K_X+\Delta)|_{S_1}). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the section s is the pull-back of

$$t := G^*\tilde{s} \in H^0(V, 2mD_V).$$

Let $u := g^*t \in H^0(X, 2m(K_X+\Delta))$. Then, by the same argument as (2.2s), we see $u|_S = s$. This means $u \in PA^{(2)}(X, 2m(K_X+\Delta))$.

We prove (b), that is, we prove that $PA^{(2)}(X, 2m(K_X+\Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(2m(K_X+\Delta))$. Let $s_1, \cdots, s_r \in A^{(2)}(S, 2m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ be a basis and let $u_1, \cdots, u_r \in PA^{(2)}(X, 2m(K_X+\Delta))$ be their lifts. Let $t_1, \cdots, t_r \in H^0(V, 2mD_V)$ be the corresponding sections. Here, $A^{(2)}(S, 2m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ generates $\mathcal{O}_S(m(K_X+\Delta)|_S)$ by Lemma 3.5. Thus, since $S \to V$ is surjective, $t_1, \cdots, t_r$ have no common zeros. Thus the corresponding sections $u_1, \cdots, u_r$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(2m(K_X+\Delta))$. $\square$

We would like to prove that the assumption in Proposition 3.7(b) holds. For this, we consider the curve version of Proposition 3.7.

Proposition 3.8. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective lc curve such that $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$. Let m be a sufficiently large and divisible integer such that $m \in 2\mathbb{Z}$. If $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then the following assertions hold.*

(a) *The following map is surjective:*

$$PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta)) \to A(S, m(K_X+\Delta)|_S).$$

(b) *$PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X+\Delta))$.*

Proof. We may assume that X is irreducible. Since X is a curve, we obtain a morphism $f := \varphi_{|k(K_X+\Delta)|} : X \to R$ such that $f_*\mathcal{O}_X = \mathcal{O}_R$. Let $f(S) =: T$. Then (1) or (2) holds.

(1) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$.
(2) $f_*\mathcal{O}_S \neq \mathcal{O}_T$.

(1)Assume $f_*\mathcal{O}_S = \mathcal{O}_T$. Then, we can use the same argument as Proposition 3.7(1).

(2)Assume $f_*\mathcal{O}_S \neq \mathcal{O}_T$. Then Proposition 2.1(2) holds. Thus we have $X \simeq \mathbb{P}^1$, $\dim R = 0$ and $\Delta = S = \{P, Q\}$ for $P \neq Q$. Therefore, the assertions (a) and (b) are obvious. $\square$

In order to construct admissible sections from preadmissible sections, we consider the following finiteness theorem. (cf. [FG, Theorem 1.1])

Theorem 3.9. *Let (C, Δ) be a projective lc curve and let m be a positive integer such that $m(K_C + \Delta)$ is Cartier. Then $\rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta))$ is a finite group where ρ_m is a group homomorphism defined by*

$$\begin{array}{rcl}\rho_m : \mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta) & \to & \mathrm{Aut}(H^0(C, m(K_C + \Delta))) \\ \sigma & \mapsto & (s \mapsto \sigma^* s).\end{array}$$

Proof. We may assume that C is irreducible. If the genus $g(C) \geq 2$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(C)$ is a finite group. Therefore, $\rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta))$ is a finite group since $\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta) \subset \mathrm{Aut}(C)$.

If $g(C) = 1$ and $\Delta \neq 0$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(C, \ulcorner \Delta \urcorner)$ is a quasi-projective scheme and $H^0(C, T_C \otimes \mathcal{O}_C(-\ulcorner \Delta \urcorner)) = 0$. Therefore, $\mathrm{Aut}(C, \ulcorner \Delta \urcorner)$ is a finite group. Thus, $\rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta))$ is a finite group because $\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta) \subset \mathrm{Aut}(C, \ulcorner \Delta \urcorner)$.

Assume that $g(C) = 1$ and $\Delta = 0$. Let $0 \in C$ be the origin of the elliptic curve C. Then $T_{-\sigma(0)} \circ \sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(C, [0])$ for any $\sigma \in \mathrm{Aut}(C)$, where $T_{-\sigma(0)}$ is the translation of C by $-\sigma(0)$. Note that $H^0(C, \mathcal{O}_C(K_C)) \simeq k$ is spanned by a translation invariant 1-form on C and that $\mathrm{Aut}(C, [0])$ is a finite group. Therefore, $\rho_1(\mathrm{Aut}(C))$ is a finite group. Thus, we can easily check that $\rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(C))$ is finite for every $m > 0$.

Finally, we assume that $C = \mathbb{P}^1$. If $|\mathrm{Supp}\Delta| \geq 3$, then $\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta)$ is a finite group. If $\deg(K_C + \Delta) < 0$, then there is nothing to prove. Therefore, we can reduce the problem to the case when $\Delta = \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner = \{\text{two points}\}$. In this case, we can easily check that $\rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta))$ is finite for every $m > 0$. Moreover, $\rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(C, \Delta))$ is trivial if m is an even positive integer. $\square$

Lemma 3.10. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective lc curve. Let m be a positive integer such that $m(K_X + \Delta)$ is Cartier. If $s \in PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$, then $(g^* s)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} = s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}$ and $g^* s \in PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ for every $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X, \Delta)$.*

Proof. Let $s \in PA(X, m(K_X + \Delta))$ and let $g \in \mathrm{Aut}(X, \Delta)$. Note that $g : X \to X$ induces an automorphism $g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} : \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \to \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$. Therefore we have

$$(g^* s)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} = (g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^* (s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}).$$

Since $s \in PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$, we see $s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} \in A(\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner, m(K_X+\Delta)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})$. This implies

$$(g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^*(s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}) = s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}.$$

Hence, we have $(g^*s)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} = s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}$. Thus we prove $g^*s \in PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$. It is sufficient to prove that $(g^*s)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner} \in A(\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner, m(K_X+\Delta)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})$. Let $h \in \mathrm{Aut}(\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner)$ and we define $h' \in \mathrm{Aut}(\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner)$ by

$$(g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}) \circ h = h' \circ (g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}).$$

It is sufficient to prove $h^*((g^*s)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}) = (g^*s)|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}$. This is equialent to $h^*(g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^*(s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}) = (g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^*(s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})$. This follows from

$$h^*(g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^*(s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}) = (g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^* h'^*(s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}) = (g|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner})^*(s|_{\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner}).$$

□

The following proposition shows that the assumption of (b) in Proposition 3.7 holds.

Proposition 3.11. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective lc curve. If $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then $A(X, m'(K_X+\Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m'(K_X+\Delta))$ for some integer $m' > 0$.*

Proof. We can apply Proposition 3.8(b). Thus $PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(m(K_X+\Delta))$. Let $G := \rho_m(\mathrm{Aut}(X, \Delta))$. Note that this group is finite by Theorem 3.9. Let $N := |G|$ and let $G = \{g_1, \cdots, g_N\}$. For $1 \le i \le N$, let σ_i be the N-variable elementary symmetric polynomial of degree i. If $s \in PA(X, m(K_X+\Delta))$, then Lemma 3.10 implies

$$(\sigma_i(g_1^*s, \cdots, g_N^*s))^{N!/i} \in A(X, N!m(K_X+\Delta)).$$

Since

$$\bigcap_{j=1}^{N}\{g_j^*s = 0\} = \bigcap_{i=1}^{N}\{\sigma_i(g_1^*s, \cdots, g_N^*s) = 0\},$$

$A(X, N!m(K_X+\Delta))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_X(N!m(K_X+\Delta))$. □

Let us prove the main theorem of this paper.

Theorem 3.12. *Let (X, Δ) be a projective slc surface. If $K_X + \Delta$ is nef, then $K_X + \Delta$ is semi-ample.*

Proof. Let $\nu : Y \to X$ be the normalization and we define Δ_Y by $K_Y + \Delta_Y = \nu^*(K_X+\Delta)$. There exists a birational morphism $\mu : Z \to Y$ from a projective dlt surface (Z, Δ_Z) where $K_Z + \Delta_Z = \mu^*(K_Z+\Delta_Z)$. By Lemma 3.4, it is sufficient to prove that $PA(Z, m_0(K_Z+\Delta_Z))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_Z(m_0(K_Z+\Delta_Z))$ for some $m_0 > 0$. Proposition 3.7(b) and Proposition 3.11 show that $PA^{(p)}(Z, pm(K_Z + \Delta_Z))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_Z(pm(K_Z + \Delta_Z))$. By Lemma 3.5, we see

$$PA(Z, pm(K_Z + \Delta_Z)) \supset PA^{(p)}(Z, pm(K_Z + \Delta_Z)).$$

Therefore, $PA(Z, pm(K_Z + \Delta_Z))$ generates $\mathcal{O}_Z(pm(K_Z + \Delta_Z))$. $\square$

4. Appendix: Fundamental properties of dlt surfaces

We summarize fundamental properties for dlt surfaces. In this section, we assume that all surfaces are irreducible. First, we recall the definition of dlt surfaces. It is easy to see that the following definition is equivalent to [Kollár-Mori, Definition 2.37].

Definition 4.1. Let X be a normal surface and let Δ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and $0 \le \Delta \le 1$. Let

$$S(X, \Delta) :=$$

$$\mathrm{Sing}(X) \cup \{x \in \mathrm{Reg}(X) \,|\, \mathrm{Supp}\,\Delta \text{ is not simple normal crossing at } x\}.$$

We say (X, Δ) is *dlt* if $a(E, X, \Delta) > -1$ for every proper birational morphism $f : Y \to X$ and every f-exceptional prime divisor $E \subset Y$ such that $f(E) \in S(X, \Delta)$.

Proposition 4.2. *Let X be a normal surface and let Δ be a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor such that $K_X + \Delta$ is $\mathbb{Q}$-Cartier and $0 \le \Delta \le 1$. The following assertions are equivalent:*

1. *(X, Δ) is dlt.*
2. *There exists a projective birational morphism $\mu : X' \to X$ from a smooth surface such that $\mathrm{Ex}(\mu) \cup \mathrm{Supp}\,\mu^*(\Delta)$ is a simple normal crossing divisor and each μ-exceptional prime divisor E_i satisfies $a(E_i, X, \Delta) > -1$.*

Proof. Note that $S(X, \Delta)$ is a finite set.

Assume (1), that is, assume that (X, Δ) is dlt. Let $f : Y \to X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ). Let

$$\mathrm{Ex}(f) := E_1 \amalg \cdots \amalg E_r \amalg F_1 \amalg \cdots \amalg F_s$$

be the decomposition to the connected components where $P_i := f(E_i) \in S(X, \Delta)$ and $Q_j := f(F_j) \notin S(X, \Delta)$. There exists a proper birational morphisms

$$Y \xrightarrow{g} Z \xrightarrow{h} X$$

such that Z is a normal surface and $\mathrm{Ex}(g) = F_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup F_s$. Indeed, Z is obtained by glueing the varieties $X \setminus \{P_1, \cdots, P_r\}$ and $Y \setminus (F_1 \sqcup \cdots \sqcup F_s)$. Note that this morphism $h : Z \to X$ is projective because Z is smooth. Thus this morphism satisfies (2).

Assume (2). Let $f : Y \to X$ be a proper birational morphism and let $E \subset Y$ be a prime divisor such that $f(E) \in S(X, \Delta)$. We prove $a(E, X, \Delta) > -1$. We may assume that there exists a proper birational morphism $Y \overset{f'}{\to} X'$ and Y is smooth by replacing Y with a desingularization of a resolution of indeterminacy $Y \dashrightarrow X'$. There are two cases: $\dim f'(E) = 0$ and $\dim f'(E) = 1$. The latter case is clear by (2). Thus we may assume $f'(E)$ is one point. Let $K_{X'} + \Delta' := \mu^*(K_X + \Delta)$. Since $f(E) \in S(X, \Delta)$, there exists an μ-exceptional curve E_i such that $f'(E) \in E_i$. We can write the prime decomposition

$$\Delta' := b_i E_i + \cdots$$

where $b_i < 1$. Then we see that $a(E, X, \Delta) > -1$ since Δ' is simple normal crossing and since the morphism $f' : Y \to X'$ is a sequence of blow-ups. $\square$

Proposition 4.3. *Let (X, Δ) be a dlt surface. Then X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial.*

Proof. See, for example, [T1, Theorem 14.4]. $\square$

Proposition 4.4. *Let (X, Δ) be a dlt surface. If a $\mathbb{Q}$-divisor Δ' satisfies $0 \leq \Delta' \leq \Delta$, then (X, Δ') is dlt.*

Proof. Since X is $\mathbb{Q}$-factorial, the assertion immediately follows from Definition 4.1. $\square$

Proposition 4.5. *Let (X, Δ) be a dlt surface. Then the following assertions are equivalent.*

1. *(X, Δ) is plt.*
2. *$\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ is smooth.*
3. *Each connected component of $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ is irreducible.*

Proof. See [Kollár-Mori, Proposition 5.51]. Note that the proof of [Kollár-Mori, Proposition 5.51] needs the relative Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing theorem for a resolution of singularities $Y \to X$. This follows from [T2]. $\square$

Corollary 4.6. *Let (X, Δ) be a dlt surface. Then each prime component of $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$ is smooth.*

Proof. Let C be a prime component of $\llcorner \Delta \lrcorner$. Then (X, C) is plt by Proposition 4.5. $\square$

Proposition 4.7. *Let $(X, C + \Delta')$ be a dlt surface where C is a smooth curve in X. Let $(K_X + C + \Delta')|_C =: K_C + \Delta_C$. Then (C, Δ_C) is lc, that is, $0 \leq \Delta_C \leq 1$.*

Proof. Let $f : Y \to X$ be an arbitrary resolution and let C_Y be the proper transform of C. Let $f^*(K_X + C + \Delta') =: K_Y + C_Y + \Delta_Y$. Note that $C \simeq C_Y$. Consider the following commutative diagram.

$$\begin{tikzcd}
C_Y \arrow[r, "\text{closed}", "\text{immersion}"'] \arrow[d, "\simeq"'] & Y \arrow[d, "f"] \\
C \arrow[r, "\text{closed}", "\text{immersion}"'] & X
\end{tikzcd}$$

We prove that Δ_C is effective. Let f be the minimal resolution. Then Δ_Y is effective and C_Y is not a prime component of Δ_Y. Thus we have $0 \leq \Delta_C$ by the adjunction formula.

Let f be a log resolution. Then, by Definition 4.1, we see $\Delta_Y \leq 1$. This means $\Delta_C \leq 1$. ☐

Corollary 4.8. *Let (X, Δ) be a dlt surface. Assume $S := \llcorner \Delta \lrcorner \neq 0$ and let $K_S + \Delta_S := (K_X + \Delta)|_S$. Then S is normal crossing and (S, Δ_S) is sdlt.*

Proof. By [Kollár-Mori, Theorem 4.15], S is normal crossing. Thus, the assertion follows from Proposition 4.7. ☐

Proposition 4.9. *Let (X, Δ) be an lc surface. Then there exists a proper birational morphism $h : Z \to X$ from a smooth surface Z such that (Z, Δ_Z) is dlt where Δ_Z is defined by $K_Z + \Delta_Z = h^*(K_X + \Delta)$.*

Proof. Let $f : Y \to X$ be a log resolution of (X, Δ) and let $K_Y + \Delta_Y := f^*(K_X + \Delta)$. Let $\Delta_Y = \Delta_Y^+ - \Delta_Y^-$ where Δ_Y^+ and Δ_Y^- are effective and Δ_Y^+ and Δ_Y^- have no common irreducible components. Since $K_Y \cdot \Delta_Y^- < 0$ and each irreducible component of Δ_Y^- is f-exceptional, there exists a (-1)-curve C such that $C \subset \mathrm{Supp}\Delta_Y^-$. Contract this (-1)-curve $Y \to Y'$. We repeat this procedure and we obtain morphisms

$$f : Y \overset{g}{\to} Z \overset{h}{\to} X.$$

Then we see that Z is smooth and $0 \leq \Delta_Z \leq 1$ where $K_Z + \Delta_Z = h^*(K_X + \Delta)$. We prove that (Z, Δ_Z) is dlt. Let $l : W \to Z$ be a proper birational morphism and $E \subset W$ be an l-exceptional prime divisor such that $l(E) \in S(Z, \Delta)$. We prove $a(Z, \Delta_Z, E) > -1$. We may assume that W is smooth and $l : W \to Z$ factors through Y. We obtain four surfaces:

$$W \overset{p}{\to} Y \overset{g}{\to} Z \overset{h}{\to} X.$$

Note that $p(E) \subset \mathrm{Supp}\Delta_Y^-$. There are two cases: (0)$\dim p(E) = 0$ and (1)$\dim p(E) = 1$.

(0)Assume $\dim p(E)=0$. Note that p is a composition of blow-ups. Since Δ_Y is simple normal crossing and $p(E)\in \mathrm{Supp}\Delta_Y^{-}$, we obtain $a(Z,\Delta_Z,E)>0$ by a direct calculation.

(1)Assume $\dim p(E)=1$. Since $p(E)\subset \mathrm{Supp}\Delta_Y^{-}$, we obtain the inequality $a(Z,\Delta_Z,E)>0$. $\square$

Lemma 4.10. *Let (X,Δ) be a dlt surface. Then there exists a proper birational morphism $\lambda : X''\to X$ from a normal surface X'' which satisfies the following properties.*

1. *For $K_{X''}+\Delta'':=\lambda^*(K_X+\Delta)$, the pair (X'',Δ'') is dlt.*
2. *If S''_i and S''_j are prime components of $\llcorner\Delta''\lrcorner$ such that $S''_i\neq S''_j$ and $S''_i\cap S''_j\neq\emptyset$, then $S''_i\cap S''_j$ is one point.*
3. *$\lambda_*(\llcorner\Delta''\lrcorner)=\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner$ and $\lambda_*\mathcal{O}_{\llcorner\Delta''\lrcorner}=\mathcal{O}_{\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner}$.*

Proof. If (X,Δ) satisfies the condition (2), then the assertion is clear. Thus we may assume that there exists prime components S_i and S_j of $\llcorner\Delta\lrcorner$ such that $S_i\neq S_j$ and $S_i\cap S_j$ has at least two points. Let $P\in S_i\cap S_j$. Note that, since (X,Δ) is dlt, $P\in \mathrm{Reg}(X)$ and $\mathrm{Supp}\Delta$ is simple normal crossing at P. Let $\mu : Y\to X$ be the blowup at P and let $K_Y+\Delta_Y:=\mu^*(K_X+\Delta)$. We apply this argument to (Y,Δ_Y) and we repeat the same procedure. Then, by a direct calculation and Lemma 2.3, we obtain the desired morphism $X''\to X$. $\square$

REFERENCES

[AFKM] D. Abramovich, L.-Y. Fong, J. Kollár and J. M^{c}Kernan, Semi log canonical surfaces, in *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque vol **211** (1992), 139–154.

[AFM] D. Abramovich, L.-Y. Fong and K. Matsuki, Abundance for threefolds: $\nu=2$, in *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque vol **211** (1992), 159–163.

[Bădescu] L. Bădescu, *Algebraic Surfaces*, Universitext, Springer-Verlag.

[Fujino1] O. Fujino, Abundance theorem for semi log canonical threefolds, Duke Math. J. **102** (2000), no. 3, 513–532.

[Fujino2] O. Fujino, Fundamental theorems for semi log canonical pairs, preprint (2012).

[FG] O. Fujino, Y. Gongyo, Log pluricanonical representations and abundance conjecture, preprint (2011).

[Fujita] T. Fujita, Fractionally logarithmic canonical rings of algebraic surfaces, J. Fac. Sci. Univ. Tokyo Sect. IA Math. **30** (1984), no 3, 685–696.

[Gongyo] Y. Gongyo, Abundance theorem for numerically trivial log canonical divisors of semi-log canonical pairs, to appear in J. Alg. Geometry.

[HX] C. D. Hacon and C. Xu, On finiteness of B-representation and semi-log canonical abundance, preprint (2011).

[Kawamata] Y. Kawamata, Abundance theorem for minimal threefolds, Invent. Math., **108**, 1988.

[KeKo] S. Keel, J. Kollár, Log canonical flips, in *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque vol **211** (1992), 95–101.

[KeMaMc] S. Keel, K. Matsuki and J. M^{c}Kernan, Log abundance theorem for threefolds, Duke. Math. J. **75** (1994), 99–119.

[KoKo] J. Kollár, S. Kovács, Birational geometry of log surfaces, preprint.

[KSB] J. Kollár, N. I. Shepherd-Barron, Threefolds and deformations of surface singularities, Invert. Math., **91**, 1988.

[KoMaMc] J. Kollár, K. Matsuki and J. M^{c}Kernan, Abundance for threefolds: $\nu = 2$, in *Flips and abundance for algebraic threefolds*, Soc. Math. France, Astérisque vol **211** (1992), 159–163.

[Kollár-Mori] J. Kollár, S. Mori, *Birational geometry of algebraic varieties*, Cambrigde Tracts in Mathematics, Vol. **134**, 1998.

[Raynaud] M. Raynaud, Contre-exemple au "vanishing theorem" en caractéristique $p > 0$, C. P. Ramanujam — A tribute, Studies in Math., **8** (1978), 273–278.

[T1] H. Tanaka, Minimal models and abundance for positive characteristic log surfaces, preprint (2012).

[T2] H. Tanaka, The X-method for klt surfaces in positive characteristic, to appear in J. Alg. Geom. .

[Xie] Q. Xie, Kawamata–Viehweg vanishing on rational surfaces in positive characteristic, Math. Zeitschrift, Vol. **266**, Issue 3 (2010), 561–570.

Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science, Kyoto University, Kyoto 606-8502 Japan

E-mail address: `tanakahi@math.kyoto-u.ac.jp`